



REALity

REALISTIC • EQUAL • ACTIVE • FOR LIFE

REAL Women of Canada • www.realwomenofcanada.ca

Volume XXXI Issue No. 6 November/December 2012

HOMOSEXUAL PARENTING IS HARMFUL TO CHILDREN

[C]hildren raised by same-sex parents reported the highest incidence of living in foster care, with grandparents or, living on their own before 18 years of age

It has been well established by many social science studies that children thrive best when raised by their own biological parents.

Homosexual activists, however, have a lot riding on everyone buying into their differing perspective—that children raised by homosexual parents do just as well (or even better) than those raised in heterosexual homes. Homosexual activists repeat this proposition in the media, the courts, and public policy forums. They do so in order to support their push for same-sex marriage, claiming it is no different in function from opposite-sex marriages.

In order to support this position, homosexual advocates have produced flawed studies based on the self-reports of homosexual parents, who knew their responses would further their political cause. That is, these studies were not based on random selection: the participants were recruited from homosexual and lesbian venues, consisting mostly of Caucasian, college educated individuals holding professional or managerial positions—a very select group of same-sex parents.

Notably absent from the pro-homosexual data were

the experiences of young adults themselves, who grew up in same-sex households. Instead, the data were based on self-assessment of same-sex parents, which was uncritically accepted by the researchers.

In 2005, the American Psychological Association (APA), well known for its politically correct, rather than scientifically correct, positions, relied on 59 pro-gay parent studies and concluded that “not a single study has found children of lesbian and gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents”.

Not one of the 59 studies referenced by the APA, however, was based on random, representative couples. Consequently, there was no scientific basis for its conclusion that same-sex parenting is not harmful to children.

CONTENTS

1. HOMOSEXUAL PARENTING HARMFUL TO CHILDREN.
2. STATISTICS CANADA 2011 CENSUS.
3. M.P. STEPHEN WOODWORTH'S MOTION 312 —A GAME CHANGER.
4. CANADA FUNDS UN FEMINIST AGENCY.
5. ANOTHER STRIKE AGAINST COMMON-LAW RELATIONSHIPS.
6. QUEEN ELIZABETH II DIAMOND JUBILEE MEDALS GIVEN TO VERY DESERVING CANADIANS.
7. FOREIGN AFFAIRS, RELIGION AND HOMOSEXUALITY
8. AMAZING SUCCESS IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH
9. THE DEAD BABY ON THE BALCONY
10. QUEBEC'S VALUES DIFFER FROM THE REST OF CANADA
11. THE VALUE OF MARRIAGE
12. THE FRAUD OF ABUSED WOMEN SYNDROME

*May the blessings of this
Christmas Season be given to you
and your family now and throughout
the whole year.*

*May God bless you all,
From the Board and Staff of
REAL Women of Canada*

RIGOROUS NEW STUDY ON HOMOSEXUAL PARENTING

In July 2012, a scholarly, peer reviewed study of children raised by homosexual parents was published in the journal, *Social Science Research*, and was based on a large random sample. Professor Mark Regnerus, of the University of Texas—Austin, found in this study that children, whose parents were same-sex while they were growing up, suffered severe deficits, compared to children raised by their married, biological parents. What was especially significant about this study was that the subjects of the study were adults raised in same-sex homes, who reported on their actual lives, as opposed to the previous studies, where only the same-sex parents made their assessment of their own parenting skills.

SPECIFIC RESULTS OF UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS STUDY

Professor Regnerus found that there were major differences between those raised in same-sex homes compared to those raised with heterosexual parents. These differences included the following:

- Children of lesbian mothers are nearly 12 times as likely to say they were sexually touched by a parent or adult as those raised in intact, biological families.
- 31% of those raised by lesbian mothers and 25 % raised by homosexual fathers were raped, compared to 8% of those raised in intact, biological families.
- 90% of children raised in a normative household were heterosexual, whereas 61% raised by a lesbian parent and 71% raised by a homosexual father were not.

Further, children raised by same-sex parents were:

- Two to four times more likely to be on public assistance.
- More than twice as likely to be unemployed.
- Twice as likely to have contemplated suicide.
- More likely to seek treatment for mental illness.

- More likely to have engaged in unmarried sex.
- At greater risk of poverty, substance abuse, and criminality.

HOMOSEXUAL ADVOCATES FURIOUS

Homosexual advocates were furious about this study and, as a result, put Professor Regnerus under withering attack.

It was imperative for them to discredit this study, and destroy Professor Regnerus's credibility because of the importance to their political cause of promoting successful same-sex parenting. Consequently, they charged him with scientific and scholarly misconduct, possible falsification of research, and deviating from ethical standards.

Because of the viciousness of these attacks by homosexual advocates, the University convened a four person faculty Committee and hired an outside expert in "research integrity" to conduct an inquiry.

The Committee concluded that none of the allegations against Professor Regnerus were substantiated, and that there was no scientific misconduct at all on his part.

PIVOTAL FINDING IN REGNERUS STUDY

What was a pivotal finding in Professor Regnerus's study was that children need stability in their lives while growing up. Professor Regnerus found that parents who had same-sex relationships were the least likely to exhibit such stability.

In this study, children raised by same-sex parents reported the highest incidence of living in foster care, with grandparents or, living on their own before 18 years of age. In fact, less than 2% of those with a mother living in a same-sex relationship reported being with their mother for all 18 years of their childhood.

The instability of same-sex partnerships is so prevalent, that the social gamble in spending significant political, legal, social and economic capital to support such relationships cannot be justified. Nor, can it be justified that children be used as tools and guinea pigs to further the dubious cause of same-sex marriage. †

STATISTICS CANADA 2011 CENSUS



Canadians should know the true story behind the recently released statistics on the family. Contrary to the headlines, the 2011 Census actually tells us that most children live with their married parents and that same-sex couples are a tiny minority.

In its survey, Statistics Canada measured several categories of families which may overlap, and which categories can be confusing: Their categories were:

- 9.389 million Census families (which included all couples—married and common-law, with or without children and included single parent families and same-sex couples)
- 13.320 million private households

- 7.059 million couple families (married and common-law, opposite-sex and same-sex, but not single parent families)
- 3.684 million couple families with children
- 5.587 million children 14 years and under, and their living arrangements
- 64,575 same-sex couples (which latter figure is inaccurate due to an error by Statistics Canada, since it included in this number, members of the same-sex living together but, married to an opposite-sex partner. This occurs most frequently in areas such as the oil sands etc., where workers double up to save money).

Here are the detailed findings on the 2011 Census:

1. Married families are predominant

- married-couple families actually increased 3.1%, and accounted for 67% of Canada's 9.389 million Census families (see above definition) in 2011. But another set of data in the same report, counting only opposite-sex couples (7.025 million) and not single parent families, reports that 79.8% of opposite-sex couples are married. (Table 3, Portrait of families and living arrangements in Canada, 2011)

2. Children 14 years and under live with married parents

- most children 14 years old and under (5.587 million), live in married, two-parent families:—63.6%.
- only 10% of children 14 years and under, lived in stepfamilies;
- of couples with at least one child 24 years and under, (married and common-law), 87.4% are intact families (two parents with biological/adopted children), and 12.6% are stepfamilies;
- 79.9% of Canadian children 14 years old and under, live in a household with two parents (63.6% married as referred to above, and 16.3% common-law) whereas 19.3% live in a household with a single parent (82.3% of whom are mothers);
- the overall percentage of children living with common-law parents is 16.3% for Canada, but some areas have exorbitantly high levels of such children—Quebec with many areas well over 50%, and areas in the north of all provinces. Cities have lower levels: Montreal is low for Quebec at 16.8%, Ottawa is 8.1%, Toronto 5.9%, Vancouver 6.2%. The prairies range from 3.4% in one southern district to 28.8% in one northern district);

3. Same-sex couples differ significantly from opposite-sex couples

- a supposed “huge” 42.4% increase (from 45,345 in 2006

to 64,575 in 2011) in same-sex couples was reported, but this adds up to only 0.8% of all census families. Even this 0.8% is not solid, as Statistics Canada included roommates, one or both reporting as married but to someone other than the roommate. This was a serious professional error by Statistics Canada as referred to above.

- 16.7% of all Census families are common-law, 19.4% of opposite sex couples are common law, whereas 67.5% of same-sex couples are common-law; (43,650 of a total of 64,575 same-sex couples)

- 47.2% of opposite-sex couples have children at home, whereas only 9.4% of same-sex couples do;

- whereas 79.8% of opposite-sex couples are married and 19.4% live common-law, the reverse occurs with same-sex couples—only 32.5% are married and 67.5% live common-law;

- female same-sex couples are almost 5 times more likely to have children at home, 16.5% of female same-sex couples have children at home versus 3.4% of male same-sex couples;

- only 12.6% of all couples with children were stepfamilies, whereas 49.7% of same-sex couples with children were stepfamilies: the children were brought to these unions from previous heterosexual marriages;

4. One-person households increasing due to longer lifespan

- one-person households increased and are now 27.6%, but that includes widows and widowers who had raised children in traditional family arrangements for years;

- 92.1% of seniors lived in private households, including 56.4% who were couples;

In defiance of all the barriers, pressures and put-downs, the traditional family (the safest and most prosperous place for men, women and children) is doing well in Canada. †

M.P. STEPHEN WOODWORTH'S MOTION 312 —A GAME CHANGER



Conservative M.P. Stephen Woodworth introduced a bill to establish a Parliamentary Committee to review the current *Criminal Code* definition (based on a 400 year old law) that human life begins only after the child has left the birth canal and the umbilical cord has been severed.

Even though this motion was defeated on September 26, 2012, the vote revealed that, with more than half of Tory MPs voting in favour (87, from a caucus of 163), basic social conservative values are substantive among elected representatives in the Conservative government.

HOW THEY VOTED

In the September 26, 2012 vote, 91 members of the House of Commons, mostly Conservatives, voted for the motion and 203 MPs, mostly NDP and Liberals, voted against the motion.

Eight Conservative cabinet ministers voted for the motion, including:

- Rona Ambrose (Edmonton—Spruce Grove), Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada and Minister for Status of Women;

- Julian Fantino (Vaughan), Minister of International Cooperation;

- Ed Fast (Abbotsford), Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway;
- Jason Kenney (Calgary—Southeast), Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism;
- Peter Penashue (Labrador), Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada;
- Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster), Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food;
- Gail Shea (Egmont), Minister of National Revenue;
- Peter Van Loan (York—Simcoe), Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

Two Ministers of State voted in favour:

- Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill), Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas and Consular Affairs);
- Alice Wong (Richmond), Minister of State (Seniors).

Four Liberal MPs and one Independent MP voted in favour:

- John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood);
- Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt);
- Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North) Deputy House Leader of the Liberal Party;
- Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, PEI);
- Peter Goldring, Independent, (Edmonton East).

The opposition NDP and Bloc leaders whipped the vote with their members required to vote against the motion regardless of their consciences.

Even though he voted against Motion 312, Prime Minister Stephen Harper allowed a free vote on this conscience issue, an established Canadian tradition, which has often been flouted by other party leaders. To his credit, the pro-abortion interim leader, Bob Rae, also allowed a free vote on this motion.

FEMINIST BACKLASH

Predictably, a media furor broke out because the Minister for the Status of Women, Rona Ambrose, voted in favour of the motion. Feminists accused her of “betraying women” and called for her resignation, disregarding an MP's democratic right to vote according to conscience. Radical feminists obviously continue to assume that government's Status of Women is there to represent only feminists and not all Canadian women, whose views differ on political issues. In fact, Minister Ambrose's main concern was discrimination against unborn girls. Gender selection abortion, where an unborn girl is aborted because of a cultural preference for boys, continues to be practiced in Canada, resulting in a significantly higher proportion of boys in certain Asian communities.

If you have not already done so, please email a note in defense of Minister Ambrose to the Prime Minister at pm@pm.gc.ca and to her office at rona.ambrose@parl.gc.ca

A NEW WAVE OF SUPPORT FOR PRO-LIFE

Even though Motion 312 was defeated, a persistent interest in the rights of the unborn is present in Canada. This vote presented a wonderful opportunity for the public to be informed about these rights. Thousands of names were presented in petitions in support of Motion 312 in the House of Commons and many newspaper articles and editorials were written about the bill. The motion certainly stirred up intense interest in the issue.

The day following the M-312 vote, on September 27, Conservative MP Mark Warawa (Langley), introduced Motion 408, to be debated in the spring of 2013, calling on the House to condemn discrimination against females in sex-selective abortions.

If the pro-abortionists thought the abortion issue was settled with the defeat of Motion 312, they're in for a rude awakening! †

CANADA FUNDS UN FEMINIST AGENCY

Canada generously pours \$700 million annually into the UN to finance various UN organizations and agencies. This money is paid, despite the fact that most agree that the UN is dysfunctional, corrupt and blatantly biased against certain countries, such as Israel.

Despite its support for the UN, Canada was unfairly criticized, in 2012, by UN envoys, such as UN food security rapporteur, Olivier De Schutter, who criticized Canada for the “pervasive” hunger and poverty here, especially among aboriginal people. Canada was also criticized by UN Human Rights chief, Navi Pilla, who targeted Quebec's anti-protest law passed in June to quell the student demonstrations on Montreal's streets. Canada was previously criticized in a UN Committee Report on torture, which recommended that the

controversial Canadian-born U.S. prisoner, Omar Khadr, who shot and killed a US soldier while a teenager in Afghanistan, should be compensated by the federal government for violation of his Charter Rights.

Because of its unreasonable approach to issues, and its waste and corruption, many of the UN member states, unlike Canada, have declined to maintain their aid commitments to the UN. In view of this shortfall, the UN, which has no authority or mechanisms to enforce commitments, has made a number of recommendations to boost its income, such as a carbon tax, a tax on air traffic, a tax on international financial and currency transactions, and a billionaire's tax. So far, these recommendations by the UN have not been acted upon by member states.

UN WOMEN AGENCY

In 2010, the UN General Assembly formed the UN Women Agency, which was an amalgamation of four other UN agencies dedicated to women's issues. The purpose of UN Women is to increase gender equality and the empowerment of women worldwide. There's nothing wrong with this, except that this is the proposed avenue by which the UN plans to promote feminism worldwide, by creating UN Women field offices throughout the world to galvanize civil society and influence national legislation. The head of UN Women is the former socialist President of Chile, Michelle Bachelet. This agency was to have operated with a \$500 million budget contributed by UN member states.

But a funny thing happened to UN Women—only approximately \$52 million, according to some sources, has actually been received by the agency from UN member countries. Even the US, under feminist friendly President Obama, has contributed just \$6 million to UN Women.

On the other hand, according to Public Accounts, Canada gave UN Women \$20 million in 2011-2012.

This money was awarded to the UN Women by the controversial Canadian funding agency, CIDA (Canada International Development Agency).

In fact, it seems Canada is propping up this absurd feminist agency, whose first report entitled "Access to Justice" is so steeped in feminist ideology that it could only have been written by a fringe feminist advocacy group.

CANADA REWARDED FOR ITS SUPPORT OF UN WOMEN

In May 2012, UN Women appointed a Consultative Advisory Group of "outstanding" international women's rights advocates and experts on gender issues. This group,

called the "Global Civil Society Advisory Group", is to help strengthen UN Women's engagements and partnerships in civil society at all levels. It is no surprise that Canada has been rewarded for its generous financial support of UN Women, by being given a spot on this illustrious committee. Our contribution happens to be in the form of a man named Todd Minerson, who has impeccable credentials in that he is the executive director of a social justice organization, which has the objective of ending men's violence against women. His background includes work in HIV/AIDS prevention. He is a graduate of Queen's University where he concentrated on gender studies and social change movements.

Despite its problems, there may still be a role for the UN in the world, such as caring for millions of refugees, monitoring and intervening in more than a dozen conflicts, and implementing development and health projects from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe.

However, it is a scandalous waste of taxpayers' money for Canada to give money to UN Women.

Please write to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and the recently appointed Minister of International Cooperation responsible for CIDA, Julian Fantino, to stop this abuse of our money.

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper

Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A2

The Honourable Julian Fantino,

Minister of International Cooperation
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6 †

ANOTHER STRIKE AGAINST COMMON-LAW RELATIONSHIPS

It is difficult to understand why the courts and governments continue to encourage common-law relationships, by providing increased legal rights for individuals living in such arrangements, similar to those provided for legal marriages.

Information continues to stack up against common-law relationships. For example, Statistics Canada has been giving us dry, but important, statistics for years on common-law relationships. This information should alarm reasonable people. For example, cohabiting relationships break up much more frequently than legal marriages: 10.2% of common-law couples separated, as opposed to only 1.7% of legally married couples between 2000 and 2008, according to one study of couples with children.

Common-law relationships also lead to more domestic violence, as married women are less likely to be abused by their husbands than cohabitating women by their partners.

Children from intact, married families also suffer less child abuse than children from common-law unions.

Yet, more and more couples, instead of entering into legal marriages, are choosing to live in common-law relationships. In the last Canadian census (2011), 19.4 % of opposite-sex couples were recorded as living in common-law relationships. This is a huge increase in such relationships, since only 7% of couples were living common-law two decades ago.

In fact, cohabitation without legal marriage is becoming the norm in Canada. Researchers call this common-law arrangement, the "sliding, not deciding" relationship. This phenomenon was explained in an article, published in the New York Times (April 14, 2012), by psychologist, Meg Jay. She described the process by which a couple moves from dating to sleeping over, to cohabitation on a gradual slope, which bypasses discussion

of both permanency and commitment in the relationship. The partnership is based essentially on the sexual relationship and economic convenience. Once in such a relationship, there is a reduced option of meeting another partner; perhaps more suitable, because the common-law couple has settled into and established a lifestyle—friends and furniture—which makes breaking up difficult. As a result, even if the couple subsequently enters into a legal marriage, because there has been no serious commitment or sense of responsibility to each other, such a marriage, remains more unstable than marriages entered into without prior cohabitation.

In a new study, published in the Journal of Marriage and Family (Volume 74, Issue 4, pages 708-725, August 2012), researchers from Cornell University surveyed approximately 600 U.S. couples. According to their research, cohabitation results in poor quality relationships because rapid sexual involvement early in the romantic relationship and the entering into shared living make it difficult for couples to

clearly judge the quality of the relationship or the character of their partner. In other words, the sexual involvement thwarts the development of key ingredients in healthy relationships, such as commitment, friendship, mutual understanding and shared values. According to the Cornell researchers:

Courtship is a time for exploration and decision-making about the relationship, when partners assess compatibility, make commitments and build on emotional and physical intimacy. The rapid entry into sexual relationships may, however, cut short this process, setting the stage for 'sliding' rather than 'deciding' to enter co-habiting unions.

In short, couples who wait longer to have sexual relations have better, and long-lasting relationships. Unfortunately, so called “good sex” is often confused with love, causing some couples to overlook problematic aspects of their common-law relationship. This, in the long run, causes the partners much pain and suffering. †

QUEEN ELIZABETH II DIAMOND JUBILEE MEDALS GIVEN TO VERY DESERVING CANADIANS



REAL Women of Canada was honoured to be selected as a partner organization with the Governor General in awarding of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal. We were asked to nominate 33 deserving Canadians to receive the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal, under the category of Social and Volunteer, for their contribution to society.

When the summary biographies of our nominees were reviewed, we were amazed to discover the variety of the wonderful voluntary contributions in which our members have been engaged. Their contribution to Canada is immense, yet they go about responding to the needs of families and communities, in Canada and around the world, without expecting any recognition. It is a fact that for most of our nominees, this is the first time their contributions have ever been recognized. We are humbled by their decency and care for the well being of the vulnerable members of our society.

In the field of human rights, some defended the civil liberties of children, parents, women and men, the disadvantaged and the unborn, through organizations, political advocacy, and recourse to all levels of the courts.

In the area of politics, many have been involved in advocacy related to the Charter, pro-life, pro-family, human rights and religious rights. At the United Nations level, some have actively participated in many conferences, summits and meetings, and mentored youth for UN participation.

Some recipients are journalists, authors, and editors, having published books and newsletters, and organized letter-writing campaigns. Others have been active in schools, pre-school nurseries, on parenting councils, home schooling and

defending parental choice in education. Several have touched many Canadians by teaching parenting skills, providing marriage support, teen mother support, fertility education, mentoring expectant mothers and fathers, adopting children and opening their homes to those in need.

The most vulnerable members of society across Canada and in the third world have benefited from our recipients' volunteer work: they have helped those disadvantaged by homelessness, mental illness, physical disabilities, or their native status. Medal recipients have founded and managed drop-in centres, food banks and food co-ops. They have been involved in drug prevention, Children's Aid, volunteer translation for social services, hospital volunteerism, and in various forms of care for the elderly.

Our recipients have been active in their churches, providing ministry in education, music, and various supports for youth, families and seniors. They have been active in fundraising for major charities, for paralympics, sports, for pro-life causes and they have also promoted the preservation of the environment through re-vegetation projects and guided wilderness trips, as well as the preservation of heritage and historical architecture.

Professionally, they have contributed at all levels: local, national, international, in Law, Medicine, Commerce, Education, the Social Sciences, Chemistry, the Royal Canadian Navy, on Boards of Directors, while regarding their family responsibilities as their major contribution to the future of our nation.

We congratulate all our remarkable recipients, from diverse national origins, for their selfless dedication to others, and we thank the Governor General for recognizing them as pro-active, dependable contributors to the public good. †

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, RELIGION AND HOMOSEXUALITY

One wonders why Canada is interfering in the internal affairs of other countries on the contentious issue of homosexuality. Certainly, Canadians would not appreciate it if other countries acted similarly toward us.

On December 7, 2006, following the defeat of the Conservative government's motion to introduce legislation to restore the true definition of marriage, John Baird, the then President of the Treasury Board, was photographed by the homosexual newspaper, Capital Xtra (Dec. 8, 2006), partying with former Liberal PM, Paul Martin, and dancing gleefully with the then Liberal MP, Belinda Stronach, over the defeat of the motion.

It is common knowledge that John Baird is a homosexual, and, apparently, his personal support for homosexuality overcame any reluctance he had about being up close and personal with his political rivals—the Liberals.

Recently, in his capacity as Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Baird has lashed out at some countries, particularly in Africa and the Caribbean, for failing to protect homosexuals from attacks, torture and incarceration.

For example, in an address to The Royal Commonwealth Society in London, England, in January 2012, Mr. Baird called “laws criminalizing homosexuality” a “hangover” from a bygone era and requested that Commonwealth countries remove these laws.

In a speech in September 2012, before the Montreal Council on Foreign Relations, Mr. Baird stated that Canada was pursuing a “principled, values-based foreign policy” which includes protecting homosexual rights as a key component.

It is important to note, however, that Mr. Baird makes a pretence, at least, of not demanding blanket civil rights for homosexuals, but only legal protection from incarceration, torture and death—rights granted to other citizens. Although many Canadians have sound moral, social and legal objections to the practice of homosexuality, most reasonable people would agree that homosexuals should not be tortured, jailed or killed merely because of their sexual orientation. However, Mr. Baird's recent actions and that of his department appear to contradict this supposed position of protection for homosexuals from criminal prosecution only. For example, as referred to in the October 2012 REALity, Canadian ambassadors in both Romania and the Czech Republic have endorsed a broad spectrum of homosexual rights, including same-sex marriage. This could only have been done with permission from the Foreign Affairs Department.

Further, at the International Parliamentary Union (IPU)

Summit which was held in Quebec City on October 21—26, 2012, the speaker of the Ugandan Parliament, Rebecca Kadaga, angrily chastised Mr. Baird for his criticism of her country for banning same-sex marriage. She stated that she was not aware that the IPU assembly had been summoned to promote gay rights. Apparently earlier at the inaugural plenary session, Mr. Baird had demonised Uganda on allegations of persecuting sexual minorities. She stated that delegates to the IPU expected respect for their country and its sovereign values. She further stated that she protested on behalf of her country the arrogance exhibited by Mr. Baird who... “had spent most of his speech attacking and promoting homosexuality”. She also disclosed that Canada had refused to grant entry visas to most Ugandan parliamentarians, and that she was prevented from making a presentation at the conference by the organizers, due to Uganda's ban on same-sex marriage. She went on to say that Uganda has consistently stood against pressure from international gay activists and the UN to accept Western sexual values. She added that the Ugandan people do not “share the same values” as Canada and pointed out that her government does not promote violence against homosexuals. Ms. Kadaga accused Mr. Baird of harbouring a “colonial attitude” towards African nations and interfering in her country's internal affairs.

One wonders why Canada is interfering in the internal affairs of other countries on the contentious issue of homosexuality. Certainly, Canadians would not appreciate it if other countries acted similarly toward us.

HOMOSEXUALS NOT SATISFIED

Homosexual activists, however, don't think Mr. Baird has gone far enough. According to articles in the Embassy Newspaper (January 18 and February 1, 2012), they argue that the Conservatives' policy on homosexuality is “grandstanding” and is only an “empty-pocket approach”. Instead, the activists want homosexual groups abroad to be funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), as an integral part of its programs, much as CIDA formerly funded feminists. Homosexual activists also want all homosexual issues to be included as foreign policy concerns and for the Conservative government to advocate at the U.N. and the Organization of American States for the inclusion of homosexual issues in all their funding and programs.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

Mr. Baird has added another issue to his “quiver” at Foreign Affairs, by demanding the protection of religious rights in foreign countries. To further this objective, \$5 million has been set aside to establish an “Office of Religious Freedom” in the Department of Foreign Affairs,

with a \$20 million price tag expected in the next four years. The office will be tiny with only a staff of five. In October 2011 and January 2012, Mr. Baird met with individuals of different faiths from across the country to discuss the new office. Mr. Baird stated that it is not merely freedom of religion that he's seeking from Third World countries, but, rather, the freedom for people to practise their religion. This is more expansive and meaningful than merely allowing one's faith within one's home or church: one needs to be able to practise one's religion in public. In this regard, wouldn't it be nice if Canadians had these same rights? We are swamped by the politically correct demands of homosexual activists who wish to restrict our religious beliefs by requiring that we practise them behind closed doors only, i.e. not in the public square.

Mr. Baird stated that he believes it is important for the Office of Religious Freedom to operate from within the Department of Foreign Affairs, so that Canadian missions abroad (i.e. Canadians on the ground in foreign countries) can keep track of what's going on with regard to religious rights. In pursuance of this policy, Mr. Baird has sharply criticized the persecution of Christians in Egypt, Iran and Iraq.

Although the best of intentions may be behind the establishment of an Office of Religious Freedom within the Department of Foreign Affairs, it does raise

some difficulties. Religious freedom is not merely about enforcing a universal norm, or legal standard (as liberal internationalists would have it). Individuals within various faiths, such as Muslims, hold multiple allegiances and celebrate diverse traditions. That is, they actually do not fit the same religious identity. Countries, such as Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iraq, for example, have serious internal differences re their Muslim faith. In short, which variation would Canada support?

APPOINTING AN AMBASSADOR FOR THE OFFICE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Although the Office of Religious Freedom is in its final stages of organization, the government has been stalled re finally opening the office because of its problem choosing an Ambassador to head the office. This appointment has proven to be far trickier than anticipated. The government has consulted many groups about this appointment, in order to find someone who is both knowledgeable about different religions and faiths and has an understanding of different cultures and international human rights and laws. This task has, apparently, proven difficult.

In short, the Ambassador for the Office of Religious Freedom is a sensitive position to fill. The Conservative government hopes, however, to announce the appointment of its Ambassador sometime this fall, so the work of the office may begin. †

AMAZING SUCCESS IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH



Remember June 2010, when Prime Minister Stephen Harper promoted the issue of maternal care at the G8 Muskoka Summit? He steadfastly refused to include abortion in Canada's contribution to this \$7.3 billion G8 initiative. Instead, he stated that Canada's contribution would focus on maternal and child health issues, which included clean water, inoculations, nutrition and the training of health workers to care for women and babies.

The mainstream media, feminists and the Liberal opposition screamed in outrage. In March 2010, Bob Rae, Liberal Foreign Affairs critic, brought forward an Opposition Motion to ensure abortion was included in Canada's international health initiative. The motion was defeated 144 to 138, as many Liberals either did not vote or voted against it.

It seems, however, that Mr. Harper was right to exclude abortion services from Canada's contribution towards maternal health care.

UNICEF (which, ironically, has long pushed abortion as part of maternal health care) has now reported that, from 1990 to 2010, the number of women worldwide who have

died from complications of childbirth has fallen by 47%. It also reported that the number of children under five who die from preventable death has fallen from nearly 12 million to an estimated 6.9 million. That's a drop of 41%.

This incredible progress is taking place in Latin America, the Caribbean, East Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa. These countries have halved their child mortality rates since 1990.

The high rates of maternal and child mortality are now concentrated in the two poorest regions of the world, Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. These two areas account for 85% of maternal deaths and 82% of deaths of children under five worldwide.

Evidence based studies of maternal health care have identified the main problem as an absence of skilled birth attendants, unsanitary medical environments and a lack or insufficiency of emergency medical and surgical facilities and supplies, including antibiotics and surgical gloves. Consequently, many maternal deaths are preventable by the provision of this basic health care.

Forget abortion. Instead, send in trained health care specialists, such as midwives, together with sufficient medical equipment, medicines and Increase initiatives to prevent chronic malnutrition, and provide universal access

to vaccinations and immunizations. It is initiatives such as these that will decrease the death rate of women and children in these two blighted areas.

When the G8 maternal health care initiative arose, Mr. Harper was accused of inserting his ideology in determining

Canada's \$1.1 billion commitment to the initiative because he excluded abortion from its provisions.

Mr. Harper apparently knew exactly what he was doing. He designated foreign aid where it most matters—saving the lives of mothers and children. †

THE DEAD BABY ON THE BALCONY

While cleaning up a recently vacated apartment in the Toronto area, the superintendent found, on the balcony, the badly decomposed body of a baby girl, wrapped in plastic. A pathologist could not determine whether the baby died before, during or after birth.

Police laid charges against the former tenant, Ivana Levkovic, under Section 243 of the *Criminal Code*, which prohibits the concealing of the body of a dead child, regardless of whether the “child died before, during or after birth”. The *Criminal Code* however, does not define the word “child”.

The trial judge navigated around the presence of a dead, unborn child, requiring protection under the law (S. 243 of the *Code*), by deciding that the words “child died before ... birth” were constitutionally vague and struck the words “before birth” from Section 243 of the *Code*. Levkovic was acquitted but this decision was appealed.

Judges had previously given themselves the authority to strike out or to add words to legislation at their own discretion in *Schachter v. Canada* a 1992 Supreme Court of Canada decision. The trial judge, therefore, found this to be a convenient solution to a politically correct dilemma.

Basically, the dilemma is between S. 223 and S. 243. On the one hand, there is no legal protection at all for the unborn child (which creates an abortion free-for-all) with the provocative S. 223 of the *Criminal Code*, which MP Stephen Woodworth tried, unsuccessfully in September, to have re-examined in Motion 312. Section 223 of the *Criminal Code* improbably states that a child becomes a human being only when it has completely proceeded from the body of the mother. On the other hand, there was another provision in the *Code* (S.243) that stated, “it

is a criminal offence to conceal the dead body of a child even though the child has not yet been born.” These provisions were confusing and contradictory.

The Ontario Court of Appeal—by no stretch of the imagination pro-life—at least faced up to the reality of a dead child with arms, legs, fingers, toes etc., and ordered a new trial based on its conclusion that the unborn child becomes a “child” when it becomes “viable”, i.e. likely to have been born alive. This was at least an improvement over the S. 223 *Code* definition of the child only becoming a human being after it has been born—but was just as nonsensical from a medical and scientific perspective.

The Supreme Court of Canada heard the appeal of the case on October 10, 2012, and has reserved judgment on it.

How is the Supreme Court of Canada going to settle the dilemma of what to do with the body of a baby who may have died before birth? It obviously was a real baby, not just a blob, or a body part of the mother. The problem with which the court has to wrestle was why should legal protection be provided a dead baby before birth, when there is no respect or protection for a living baby before birth? Perhaps the court will escape this difficulty by finding, as did the trial judge, that the “before birth” part is too vague and strike it out of the *Code*. If so, that will be that, and the deception that there is no human being in the womb—a legal nothing—will blithely go on.

What the case points out is that when we first practice to deceive, i.e. pretending that there is no baby in the womb, we become caught up in the tangled web of our own lies. †

QUEBEC'S VALUES DIFFER FROM THE REST OF CANADA

Quebec is thumbing its nose at federal jurisdiction over criminal laws, and is trying, through the back door, what it cannot do directly or legally.

Ever since the 1960's, Quebec has embarked upon a policy of independence, both from the Catholic Church, which had given direction to the province for centuries (which, by the way, had preserved Quebec's highly prized culture and language) and from the values and vision of

the rest of Canada.

That is, with diminished moorings in religious belief, Quebec has acquired values very distinct from the rest of Canada. It has the highest suicide and abortion rates, the highest use of marijuana, and the lowest marriage and highest common law rates in Canada. Because of this, Canadian statistics on these issues are skewed to provide a picture of Canada quite different from the way the majority of Canadians actually live.

Now, apparently, Quebec wishes to acquire the highest death rate in Canada as well, by way of euthanasia.

Quebec has arranged this by establishing, last spring, an all-party Committee of the National Assembly, composed of those sympathetic to euthanasia. Notwithstanding the fact that most of the presentations to the Committee opposed euthanasia and assisted suicide, the Committee reached a completely different conclusion, and supported these offences.

Based on this biased report, the minority government of the Parti Quebecois recently announced that it is going to legalize euthanasia in that province, even though, Section 241(b) of the *Criminal Code* prohibits such activity.

The Quebec government, however, argues that Quebec is able to pass such a law without Ottawa's consent because Quebec has jurisdiction over health and professional (medical) qualifications, and that giving a person a lethal injection is merely another form of medical treatment! In addition, the Parti Quebecois plans to issue a directive to Crown Prosecutors to not enforce the part of the *Criminal Code* that bans euthanasia and

doctor assisted suicide.

In effect, Quebec is thumbing its nose at federal jurisdiction over criminal laws, and is trying, through the back door, what it cannot do directly or legally.

A group, called The Physicians Alliance for the Total Refusal of Euthanasia, has recently been formed in Quebec. This group believes that any law allowing doctors to intentionally end the life of their patients is contrary to the Hippocratic oath, the goals of medicine and the good of patients, especially the most vulnerable and those who cannot speak for themselves.

How many physicians will join this organization and how effective it will be in rejecting the government's policy is a very important question. Also, will this minority government's legislative initiative on death and dying be supported by the opposition parties to enable the legislation to pass?

What is certain is that the province of Quebec has embarked on a death wish in more ways than one. †

THE VALUE OF MARRIAGE



The left-wing, so called "Progressives", proclaim that the traditional marriage of a man, woman and child (ren) is no longer necessary and that other so-called "family" arrangements work just as well. How wrong they are!

There are many significant reasons why traditional marriage is critical to society's well-being. Two such reasons are:

1. MARRIAGE BREAKDOWN AND POVERTY

Marriage breakdown is the greatest cause of poverty in Canada. According to Statistics Canada, the quickest way for children to live in poverty is for their parents to be separated, or divorced, or never married.

This is because one-parent families have the lowest average total income. For example, in 2008, female, one-parent families had an average annual income of only \$42,300. This meant that, in 2008, 36% of children under 18 years of age, (about 218,000 children) lived in low-income families headed by a woman. In contrast, in 2008, two-parent families had an average annual income of \$100,200.

According to the US Brookings Institution, if individuals do just three things: 1) finish high school; 2) work full time; and 3) marry before they have children – their chances of being poor drop from 15% to 2%.

Research by the UK Centre for Social Justice indicates that if a child is born into poverty today, that child is more likely to remain in poverty than at any time since the late 1960s. The Centre identified five key paths to poverty, the first being family breakdown. The others were: serious

personal debt, drug and alcohol addiction, failed education, unemployment and dependency.

The Well to Do View Marriage Differently

There appears to be a growing gap between educated, married, employed and well-off couples and those who are less educated, in marginal or no employment and without a steady life partner. This was outlined in an article in the *Journal of Public Policy*, "The Family in America" (Spring 2012). According to Dr. Bryce J. Christensen, editor of the *Journal*, there is a retreat in the US (and Canada) from wedlock by the nation's poor and working class citizens. This has resulted in such couples, who have neither money nor education, having trouble keeping their marriages, if any, together. This differs markedly from privileged, educated couples who generally regard unwed parenthood, desertion and divorce as socially unacceptable. As a result, their marriages are more stable, with the brunt of family breakdown occurring in the poorer working classes which have less firm standards on marriage, single parenthood, and living common-law. These attitudes all contribute to their poverty.

2. MARRIAGE LEADS TO LOWER MORTALITY RISK

Sociological, psychological and medical research indicates that married couples tend to do better in every important measure of physical, social and psychological well-being, compared to the unmarried. Significantly, this health and mortality gap between married and unmarried people has remained constant over the past two decades. The reason for this phenomenon can be attributed, in large

part, to the protective quality of marriage, which provides a social control in the marriage, and actively influences and directs the behaviour of the partners. Essentially, this involves couples individually bringing forward their concerns to one another about unhealthy lifestyles, such as smoking, physical inactivity, harmful eating habits and reminding each other of regular medical needs, such as medical check-ups, and ensuring the consumption of prescribed medication, etc. That is, family members encourage other members to change their harmful behaviours, which contributes to their well being. Unfortunately, those who cohabit together without marriage are less likely to interfere with their partner's habits and behaviour. Therefore, there is less influence to change harmful behaviour.

Encouraging Marriage

There are a number of specific policy recommendations that would be of assistance in supporting marriage:

1. Although schools seem to relish teaching sex education to the students, they rarely, if ever, provide education on the importance of establishing and sustaining relationships and good parenting practices. This pre-marriage education should be included in all school programs.

2. Many people later regret their divorce and wish that something more could have been done to save their marriage (second marriages have an even higher attrition rate). It is essential to provide counselling services to couples who wish to pursue reconciliation in their marriage. REAL Women of Canada has long advocated tax-deductible counselling for troubled marriages. If such assistance is tax-deductible, it becomes financially more manageable for couples, and also becomes more "respectable" since it is a recognized tax deduction. In the case of low-income couples, such counselling should be subsidized. †

THE FRAUD OF ABUSED WOMEN SYNDROME AS A LEGAL DEFENCE

If one wants to kill one's spouse, it certainly pays to be a woman.

In the early 1980's, feminism was at its most influential in Canada, largely due to the millions of dollars the government was paying to support a handful of feminist activists who fronted these organizations. This funding was necessary, since these organizations had no grass roots support and few members. The prominent feminist organization at that time was the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC), which vigorously lobbied to have a woman appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada, who they insisted must be "suitable for our purposes". In 1982, they were awarded with the appointment of feminist lawyer Bertha Wilson. The latter, incidentally, never actually practiced law, but worked as a librarian/researcher for a large Toronto law firm. However, she was a feminist and a woman, so no one questioned her meager credentials for this prestigious appointment.

Judge Wilson repaid the feminists for her appointment in spades. In 1990, she gave a speech at Osgoode Hall Law School in Toronto, during which she claimed that some Canadian laws were so biased in favour of men that they were "ludicrous". She stated, further, that since many laws supposedly reflected only a "male perspective", they should be revised at the earliest opportunity. REAL Women of Canada laid a complaint with the Canadian Judicial Council about the obvious prejudice and bias of Judge Wilson, but our complaint, as is the practice of the Council (which practice continues today), was dismissed out-of-hand.

Judge Wilson promptly went about revising laws to suit her feminist perspective. One of her more shameful

decisions occurred in the *Lavallee* case in 1990, when she concluded (with the male members of the court apparently too intimidated to raise logical objections) that the history of abuse of a woman was relevant in assessing her guilt or innocence when she killed her partner. In that particular case, Ms. Lavallee killed her common-law partner by shooting him in the back of the head, as he was walking out of a room. She got off on the abused wife defence because she was held not responsible for her actions based on her partner's abuse over a four-year period. The evidence of her abuse however, was problematic since it was based solely on the evidence of her psychiatrist, who reported what she had told him about her alleged abuse. Such evidence, in less hysterical, less politically correct times, would have been dismissed as hearsay. There was no other evidence to support her alleged abuse, such as medical records, etc.

This defence is not open to men, even though there are many studies which indicate that men experience as much abuse from their partners as do women, and that women are just as likely to instigate domestic abuse as men.

The feminists were so delighted with this newfound loophole for women that, in 1995, they pressured the Minister of Justice, Allan Rock, to investigate all women imprisoned who had killed their partners prior to 1990 when the battered wife defence was not available to them.

Ninety-eight women, who had killed their partners in supposed self-defence, obligingly stepped forward to have their cases retroactively reviewed by a feminist judge. Seven of these cases were determined to have been due to abused woman's syndrome. Feminist Attorney General Anne McLellan, at that time, decided that four of the seven should be granted the Royal Prerogative of Mercy (S. 690

of the *Criminal Code*). One of these women, by the way, a Nova Scotian, had deliberately run over her partner with her car and then, with amazing thoroughness had backed up her car to run over him again. Another one of these women had killed her partner with a hammer, while another had stabbed her victim. Obviously, the justice system was cradled in a network of feminist activists.

In October 2012 (22 years after Judge Wilson's decision), someone decided to actually find out whether women who killed their spouses did so in self-defence, in their supposedly desperate reaction to chronic battery. Dr. Dominique Bourget, a forensic psychiatrist at the Ottawa Mental Health Centre, used information provided by the Quebec coroner's reports, police records and autopsy

results and medical charts, between 1991 and 2010. She found that only 26% of the women charged with murder of their partners had been victims of domestic abuse. According to the study about half of the female spouses who killed their partner used a knife, 35% used a gun, two women strangled their partner, and another used a blunt instrument. Fewer than half of these women suffered from any identified psychological problem and fewer still had been in trouble with police. Apparently, these killers just didn't like their spouses.

Yet, the abused spouse defence continues on. Women just have to show, by even dubious evidence, that they have been abused and then they are off the hook. If one wants to kill one's spouse, it certainly pays to be a woman. †

MEMBERSHIP FEES FOR 2013 NOW DUE

Membership fees are due for the year 2013. For your convenience we have enclosed a self-addressed envelope.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would renew your membership as soon as possible. It is you who keep REAL Women going! Without your support, we would not be able to continue with our work on behalf of the traditional family.

Over the years, we have established a strong presence in the media, the government and the courts, which must not be lost. For example, the prostitution case will be heard in the Supreme Court of Canada in the spring of 2013, and REAL Women will be a party to this legal challenge.

Your support has made REAL Women a strong voice in protecting society. We need your continued help during these difficult financial times. Please renew your membership.

We promise to continue to serve you and your family faithfully now and always. †

RENEW TODAY

SUPPORT OUR WORK TO DEFEND THE FAMILY

Yearly membership: \$25 Yearly group rate **\$30**

Contributions are not tax deductible as we are a political lobby group.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

Send online at www.realwomenofcanada.ca or by mail. Thank you.



Find Us on [Facebook](#).

REALity is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203
www.realwomenofcanada.ca • info@realwomenofcanada.org

FAMILY SUPPORT



No Grandma,
Listen,
Double-click the Internet
Explorer Icon.

Publications Mail Agreement Number 40051461

Return Postage Guaranteed. **REALity** is a publication of REAL Women of Canada PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa, ON K1G 3J1